

Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. Telephone NATIONAL 2066

VOL. IV, NO. 50, 1st Number 202, DECEMBER 10, 1947 * Editors: FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

THE COMINTERN FOR ASIA

by Kiyoshi K. Kawakami

When the Comintern, "dissolved" in 1943, flung aside its veil of wartime deception and set up headquarters in Belgrade, many observers noted with some relief that the new-old organization had singled out Europe as its objective. Other continents seemed to be outside its purview.

These observers are in for disillusionment. It is reported that the Comintern will shortly hold a meeting in Montevideo. And no one who has noted the persistence of Soviet policy in Asia can doubt that the Comintern will do in that continent what it has done in Europe. Before 1943 the Japanese and Chinese Communists were represented on the Central Executive Committee of the Comintern. Now other Asiatic countries have active Communist parties which will join hands with Moscow.

The new masters of the Kremlin have a keen sense of timing. And the opportune time to give the Comintern the go-ahead signal for Asia will not be long coming. For the situation in Asia is developing in a way highly satisfactory to Moscow.

Mr. William C. Bullitt, in a recent article written after a visit to China, has come out with a proposition that the United States should expend \$1,350,000,000 to save China from Russia. The plan envisages setting up credits for the Nanking Government, checking the inflation which that Government seems incapable of controlling and, more important, creating ten new divisions trained by American officers and equipped with American arms. This sounds like an unofficial invitation to the Kremlin to vitalize the Comintern for Asia.

II

It is now almost a century since Nicholai Muraviev led his famous expedition into the Amur region, north of Manchuria. Ever since then, Russia, Czarist or Communist, has cast covetous glances toward China.

Soon after Lenin assumed power, his Foreign Commissar issued a flamboyant proclamation pledging the Red Government to return to China "without compensation" all the rights and concessions wrung by its Czarist predecessor from the Manchu Government at Peking. It was an insincere pledge made with tongue in cheek. The real purpose was to

seduce China into recognizing Bolshevik Russia, then without a friend among the nations of the world.

When China did enter into negotiations with Moscow on the basis of that roseate promise, the Red diplomats talked as though no such promises had ever been made. The Sino-Soviet treaty of 1924 was a far cry from what China had expected to obtain from the "altruistic" Bolsheviks.

In the early years of the Red regime Lenin was confronted by the gordon sanitaire which the capitalistic nations had established along Russia's western frontier. In consequence he adopted the "Asia Detour" policy. Its central idea was the destruction of Western imperialism in Asia, as a prerequisite to the destruction of capitalism in Europe itself. It was Lenin's reasoning that the capitalistic powers of Europe could not long survive the loss of their Eastern colonies and markets.

Following this reasoning Lenin first concentrated upon Afghanistan, as the gate to India which was his real objective. He built radio stations along the Afghan border, and sent many propagandists into Kabul. Airplanes laden with Communist papers and moving pictures flew into the land of the Amir. Hindu and Afghan students trained for fifth column activities were ordered into this new field.

However, Lenin made little headway in Afghanistan, for British influence at Kabul and the British hold upon India were then still strong enough to repel any effective Red infiltration.

So the Bolsheviks turned to China, where chronic chaos, civil strife, and age-old political corruption provided an almost ideal condition for Red machinations. And China, next to India, was Britain's most profitable field of operation. Here, then, the Bolsheviks hoped to kill two birds with one stone -- winning the victims of oppression to Communism, and crippling British interests which, under Japanese pressure following World War I, had already shown signs of decline.

On April 6, 1927, agents of the Chinese Government at Peking raided the office of the Military Attache of the Soviet Embassy and seized a great mass of incriminating documents. The significance of the raid was minimized in the United States. The menace of Communism in Asia was then little realized by the American public. Moreover, the Peking Government at that time was dominated by Marshall Chang Tso-lin, the Manchurian warlord friendly to Japan, and both Chang and Japan were regarded askance in America.

Just five weeks after the Peking raid, however, the agents of Scotland Yard swooped down upon Soviet House in London, where more than a thousand Soviet officials and employees were quartered. Many of the papers seized there on May 12, 1927, tallied with the exposure of Soviet policies already made at Peking.

III

In the light of the documentary evidence thus obtained it was clear that the Soviet modus operandi in China was guided by the principle of "divide and rule". In the early 1920's, Moscow was negotiating a treaty for the restoration of friendly relations with Peking. Simultaneously, influential Red agents -- Joffe, Borodin, and Galen, who later revealed himself as General Bluecher, commander in chief of the Red Army in East Siberia -- were in Canton, aiding the dissident "provisional government" set up there by the late Sun Yat-sen.

After Sun Yat-sen's death, in 1925, his protege, Chiang Kai-shek, continued to receive aid from Soviet Russia. But, while aiding Chiang in the south, Moscow also supported General Feng Yu-hsiang in the north, primarily because Feng and Chiang were avowed enemies.

For a short while Feng had paraded as "the Christian General". But once he saw that money and arms could be obtained from Russia he lost interest in Christianity. This same Feng is now sojourning in the United States. The junket seems to be financed by the Nanking Government, but Feng takes every opportunity to speak ill of that government and Chiang Kai-shek. The New York Daily Worker, leading exponent of American Communism, carried a revealing interview with Feng in its issue of December 4.

Today, as twenty years ago, Soviet Russia's major objective is China. And today China's internal condition is much worse than it was two decades ago, offering greater encouragement to Red inroads than ever before. Chiang Kai-shek, once Moscow's fair-haired boy, is now an avowed foe of Communism, but he is powerless to stem the Red tide unless he is helped by America, if even then. In Soviet eyes Chiang is a renegade, and America an arch imperialist which has stepped into the Japanese shoes in China.

IV

Whatever the strictures heaped upon the Nanking Government, in General Albert C. Wedemeyer's suppressed report and elsewhere, the United States, under the present circumstances, can see no alternative but to prop up that Government with some substantial aid. Already this is producing a crescendo of Comintern propaganda designed to frustrate the "Marshall plan" for China, just as the similar but more elaborate plan now in the making for Europe has been the target of Red shafts.

Already reports come from Harbin that Communist delegates from Russia, China, Korea and Outer Mongolia have been meeting in that North Manchurian metropolis and have set up there the Oriental counterpart of

the Cominform established in Belgrade two months ago. Japan's Communist Party, militant as it is, dared not fly in the face of MacArthur's restraining influence and therefore had no formal representation at the Harbin meeting. But there is no lack of Japanese "Reds" in the Russian sphere of influence, where Russia has organized an "army of liberation" from the numerous Japanese units captured in Manchuria in August, 1945.

Looking ahead, we must envisage the day when Outer Mongolia will be incorporated into the Soviet Union, like the Baltic Republics in Europe. Korea, Sinkiang, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and a part of North China, are other possible Far Eastern Soviet Republics, if and when Communistic governments are firmly established in these huge areas. That might give Russia quite a bloc of seats in the United Nations.

To facilitate the incorporation of such satellite States, existing and potential, into the Red system, Stalin, in February, 1944, issued an ukase granting "independence" to the 16 Soviet Republics. Ostensibly they are permitted to maintain their own national defense. Actually they may send and receive diplomatic missions. The underlying purpose of the policy, of course, is to expedite inclusion in the Soviet Union of new States, "independent" but firmly under Moscow's influence.

A quarter-century ago Lenin's "Asia Detour" policy meant "Defense in Europe, Advance in Asia". Now the Soviet policy is "Advance in Europe, Advance in Asia, Advance in the Americas". Thanks to the war, and the concessions made to Soviet Russia by its wartime allies, the floodgate of Communism has been opened everywhere.

Count Muraviev (not to be confused with Nicholai Muraviev), the Czarist Foreign Minister at the turn of this century, forecast this situation when he said:

"I believe that Russia has a civilizing mission such as no other people in the world, not only in Asia but also in Europe. . . . We Russians bear upon our shoulders the New Age; we come to relieve the tired men".

Communist Russia, even more than its imperial precursor, believes that those who would check its "civilizing mission" are tired. The period of post-war weariness is the time to strike.

K. K. Kawakami, an outstanding Japanese liberal, was for many years Washington correspondent of the Osaka Mainichi and the Tokyo Nichi-Nichi. After Pearl Harbor, he was active in the preparation of psychological warfare material for U. S. government agencies.

Reproduction or quotation is permitted only when credit is given to HUMAN EVENTS. Trial subscription, three months for \$3. Six months, \$5.50. One year, \$10. Two years, \$18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year \$11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective. Address all correspondence to: HUMAN EVENTS, 1323 M Street, WASHINGTON 5, D. C.

By Frank C. Hanighen

December 10, 1947

The reference file on General Eisenhower's connection with the Morgenthau Plan is building up. In this column, on October 15, 1947, it was recalled that the United Nations World last spring attributed the authorship of the plan for destroying German industry to General Eisenhower. Now, Mr. Morgenthau himself provides some evidence in a series of articles in the New York Post (November 24 to 29). The former Secretary of the Treasury does not confirm the United Nations World story. Far from it. Morgenthau takes most of the credit (or discredit) himself. But he does paint the former European commander of our forces as an enthusiastic supporter of his idea for the "pastoralization" of Germany; and he apparently found Eisenhower's endorsement of some use in selling his fatal notion.

In the November 24 issue of the Post, the former Secretary of the Treasury relates how depressed he was (in 1944) to find those in the State Department who wished to maintain German industry. He went to Eisenhower for his opinion: "General Eisenhower gave a straight-from-the-shoulder answer. 'I want to say that I am not interested in the Germany economy', he said, 'and personally I would not like to bolster it if that will make it easier for the Germans'. The soft peace demands, Eisenhower continued, came from people who wanted to make Germany a bulwark against Russia. True, the strength of Russia was 'fantastic'. But Russia now had all she could digest, and her present problems would keep her busy until long after we were dead. 'The whole German population is a synthetic paranoid', and there is no reason for treating a paranoid gently. The best cure, he concluded, would be to let the Germans stew in their own juice."

* * * * *

The American Civil Liberties Union has issued a statement, Student Activities on Campus, in which it takes a liberal and sound position. It says: "1. Any organization for political action or discussion, whether or not affiliated with a particular party, including the Communist Party, should be allowed to organize and be recognized on any campus and no student should be discriminated against at any time because of membership in any such organization.

"2. If, after investigation and fair hearings, an organization is found by the competent authority to be concealing or misrepresenting its auspices and affiliations, such finding should be published to the college or university at large but such finding should not be ground for withdrawal of recognition, or suspension, or other disciplinary action."

It will be noted that the ACLU specifies that "competent authority" can expose "front organizations" by "investigation and fair hearings". Substantially that was the task which Mr. Parnell Thomas' Committee on Un-American Activities was trying to perform on a national scale. What more "competent authority" exists than the Congress of the United States? And what fairer hearings than those conducted on ten Hollywood writers and directors?

It is true that the hearings on these ten did not proceed very far. They refused to answer "yes" or "no" whether they were members of the Communist Party. Therefore, by law, they have been cited for contempt and indicted, to face trial before a Federal court. We suspect that if the ACLU prescription for campuses is followed, it will come to a similar end -- a refusal to testify, embellished with lofty appeals to the Bill of Rights, by students who want to conceal their affiliations. For in no area of our social picture has the "ends-justify-the-means" practice been more prevalent than in the colleges.

Copyright 1947 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

We recall what an old British Socialist said to us a decade ago in London. He had met many young American students who attended the London School of Economics. Our British friend remarked: "One disturbing thing I notice about these American students. They want to put over Socialism by a trick, a conspiracy, by concealing their real intentions. I try to tell them that such a course is not honest and will sooner or later impair their efforts. Here in the Labour Party, we are Socialists and proud of it. We fight for our principles as Socialists openly and aboveboard; we have lost many votes for that reason. Eventually, however, I think we shall triumph. But we won't persuade the British people of the justice and feasibility of our program unless we do so openly and honestly."

* * * * *

In London, Marshall and Molotov have carried on their tedious duel for over two weeks, with few of the rounds offering any more than passing interest. At one point last week, they both seemed to be suddenly aware of the "forgotten factor" in the German theorem -- the German people. Molotov obviously was bidding for Russian popularity among the Germans by his advocacy of a "central German government". And when Marshall replied, he may well have tried to bolster our prestige between the Rhine and Oder when he asserted that the eastern boundaries of present Germany are not necessarily permanent. Or, our Secretary of State may merely have been trying to destroy any prestige which the Russians might have among the Germans. Molotov had to reject this idea. For the satellite government in Warsaw which lays claim to former German territory insists that the present boundary is permanent. At any rate, the prospects of this sparring are not promising. And the question remains -- if the Conference ends in a debacle what will the Russians do next?

One answer may be found in a piece of news which received no notice in this country. On October 15, the Schweizer Illustrierte Zeitung ran the report of an interview with Dr. Rudolph Paul. Dr. Paul had been Minister-President of Thuringia under Russian occupation. Early in October, he fled the Russian zone to take refuge in the American zone. He gave this interesting explanation of his exile in the Zeitung interview: "The leaders of the SED (Communist-dominated party) asked me to call a meeting (after the expected failure of the London Conference), to proclaim the independent Republic of Eastern Germany, and to ask that this republic be incorporated into the Soviet system. I myself was to become Prime Minister of the new republic. If I declined this demand, I would be banished to the Urals. So, I preferred to flee."

* * * * *

One important question anxiously discussed in Washington these days is: Will the Arabs really put up a fight over Palestine? Dispatches in the past few days from that area seem to indicate an affirmative answer. The militant Arab activities in Tel-Aviv suggest strong, well-organized and fanatical resistance. But there are many who challenge the efficacy of the jihad or Holy War, declared by the faculty of el-Azhar University in Cairo last week. It is not denied that the University, center of Arab culture, exerts great influence throughout the Arab and Moslem world. But it is pointed out that when Turkey, through the agency of a tame Caliphate during World War I, declared a Holy War, the non-Turkish Moslems signally failed to respond.

Experts on the Moslem world do not think that this instance offers a parallel with the situation today. The Turkish jihad, it is true, did fail. But it failed because it ran head on into the rising tide of Pan-Arabism, which the British cleverly exploited through Colonel Lawrence and promises of Arab independence. To-

day, the situation is reversed. The call to Moslems now, instead of being blocked by Pan-Arabism, draws its lifeblood from this developing force in world politics. At any rate, caution should be exercised in discounting the force of today's Holy War.

* * * * *

Mr. Loy Henderson, head of the Near East Division of the State Department, is slated to be named Ambassador to Turkey, according to reliable sources. Mr. Henderson has served three years in his present post and has been the target of much criticism by Zionists for his opposition to Palestine partition. Some circles conclude that "the Zionists have finally got him". Be that as it may. The shift of Mr. Henderson to Ankara would be natural and fitting. For Mr. Henderson is widely regarded as the author of the Administration's aid to Turkey and Greece. In the Turkish capital he would undoubtedly wield much influence -- not only on the Turks, but also on neighboring Moslem States with whom United States relations will undoubtedly be difficult, to say the least, in "days of wrath".

Mr. Henderson would replace Ambassador Edwin Wilson, who has made an excellent record in the Turkish capital. Wilson would be promoted to the position of Ambassador to France, replacing Mr. Jefferson Caffrey. For some time, it has been felt that Mr. Caffrey has fallen short of meeting the exacting and delicate duties in this key post. Indeed, members of the Herter Committee on their return to Washington from their survey abroad strongly urged the State Department to make a change. Mr. Wilson, it is believed, would carry the burdens in the Place de la Concorde much more effectively. Mr. Caffrey, at the end of a long and distinguished career in the Foreign Service, would be retired.

* * * * *

The French seem eager to underline the phrase vae victis, as may be seen in the following quotation from People and Freedom (London, October, 1947): "As you pass over the emergency bridge across the river Main to enter what is left of 'golden Mainz' you see a big hoarding, colourfully decorated with the Lilies of the Bourbon kings, the triumphantly crowing Cock of the revolutionary Republic, the imperial eagle of Napoleon and the lictorial Fasces of the Third and Fourth Republics. Under each emblem, recorded in large ciphers, are the years of earlier French occupations: 1642-1673, 1793-1804, 1804-1814, 1918-1930. Then 1945--. The French never came to these lands as 'democrats' but quite simply as victors enjoying the spoils of victory. It is in this light that their presence is endured by the population today as it was three hundred, two hundred and one hundred years ago. So when the French authorities requisition 80 per cent of the 1947 Rhine and Moselle vintage crop, the best and sweetest for over a hundred years, and take it away to France to turn it into French brandy, they follow a familiar pattern."

The French, as the article emphasizes, did not come as "democrats", but simply as conquerors. But the British and Americans in their present occupation of Germany have professed to uphold "democracy"; and their conduct has only served to discredit the word: "It is precisely in the West and South of Germany, among a population whose European instinct and traditions are as old as any in Europe, and whose burghers and peasants never really lost their inborn individual and corporative democratic propensity, that Democracy has become a byword, evoking sneers, anger or sorrow. It is in the British and American zones that one hears the ugly word Retorten-Demokratie, "synthetic democracy", as denoting a lifeless, sterile product evolved from a formula in a political laboratory and therefore unrelated to, and unworkable in, the organic life of a community of men."

Book Events

In Darkest Germany, by Victor Gollancz. Hinsdale, Illinois: Henry Regnery Company, \$3.50. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

This book is pasticcio from a now-famous series of letters sent out of Germany last year by Mr. Gollancz to various British newspapers and magazines. These letters had a double importance: First, they afforded English readers their first glimpse into the nature and meaning of the Punic peace imposed upon Germany by her conquerors in the name of freedom and democracy; Second, the author of the letters is a prominent English Jew. That is to say, they were a Jewish protest against the fanatical and vindictive spirit in which the early policies of the Occupation were shaped; the spirit of which Mr. Morgenthau became the avatar. It is not merely that Mr. Gollancz, as one of a race which owes the sufferings of two thousand years to the principle of collective guilt, objects to the application of the principle to another people; it is also that he is persuaded that the only hope of saving the world lies in returning good for evil. Indeed the very fact that the Jews have been so often and so greatly outraged seems to him all the more reason that they should be "specially ready for reconciliation".

Yet Mr. Gollancz is capable of anger and bitterness. He is angry, for example, about the lunacy, as he calls it, of the progressive dismantling of German industry, which has aggravated the difficulties of the Occupation and multiplied the miseries of a population already in the abyss of despair. He is bitter about the bureaucratic confusions and cross-purposes of the British rulers in Germany and appalled by the luxury of their living habits as contrasted to the unspeakable degradation of the Germans. The Occupation staff and their families comprised, he discovered, a new Herrenvolk, less vulgar and arrogant perhaps than the Nazis, but scarcely less stupid. A British variety of Jim Crow fully as rigid as that of the southern United States was everywhere evident. When Mr. Gollancz was in Germany, native employees of the Occupation were not permitted to use the same toilets as the British and were so informed by notices on the doors. Germans were forbidden to enter hotels, unless in the company of a British person, and even then were forbidden to appear in the public dining rooms. They were forbidden to enter movie theaters except as guests of the British, and even so were obliged to wait in a separate queue until a seat or standing place was available. A popular German hairdresser was threatened by the military with confiscation of his premises because he had kept a British officer's wife waiting 20 minutes. In every city of the British zone all the better and least damaged buildings have been requisitioned as offices or clubs or official residences; among the higher British officials "the more modest type of residence was a mansion; the less modest a palace". But in places like Hamburg, Duesseldorf, Dortmund, Oberhausen and Cologne, Mr. Gollancz found millions of Germans living in cellars and in underground bunkers; often families of six or eight in a single narrow cell. Where a German household was evicted from a requisitioned building, its members were permitted to take their bed clothing but not their beds, which, being classified as furniture, had to be left for the convenience of the conquerors.

Mr. Gollancz had no difficulty in finding evidences of a general starvation that were concealed or disguised in the official ration figures. He estimated that the diet of those Germans who were unable or unwilling to use the black market was somewhere between 400 and 1,000 calories a day. The cities were full of rachitic children and in Hamburg the number of persons of all ages who had reached the stage of starvation characterized by oedema was estimated at more than 100,000. By way of supporting evidence the book is filled with dozens of horrifying photographs taken under the author's supervision. In many instances he had himself photographed with the sufferers to guarantee the authenticity of the pictures.